

## HAS ALL EVILS AND NO MERITS OF WILSON PACT

U. S. With One Vote Is Bound  
to Help Majority Against  
Own Interests.

(Continued from page one)

of Nations covenant. If more had been taken, it would have been better.

One of the principal effects of the treaty, both republicans and democrats would be its termination of the Anglo-Japanese alliance.

Sen. Reed contended that the treaty was an alliance and gave the United States only one of four votes and pledged the United States to make war, if necessary, in support of British, Japanese or French interests in the Pacific.

Masked by Fine Phrases.

"The real purpose of the treaty is cunningly masked by fine phrases," Sen. Reed declared. "It is a verbal photograph of Eliza Root, but now withstanding its sugar coating it is nothing more nor less than a quadruple alliance between Great Britain, France, Japan and the United States by which they mutually bind each other to exert their power and influence in the Pacific and for the maintenance of the rights of each in their insular possessions and insular dominions in the region of the Pacific ocean. If we sign this treaty, we bind ourselves to go to the assistance of Japan, Great Britain and France, in the event that their insular dominions in the region of the Pacific are threatened. I have quoted from the preamble but the purpose is made plain by article two. That article plainly means that they will jointly go to war if necessary or by their combined power of threats intimidate other nations."

An Entangling Alliance.

"It is not only an entangling alliance, but it is an alliance which entangles us in the east and compels the United States to support Japan or England or French claims if the majority of the four powers shall so determine. It is an entangling alliance against our friends, the Chinese and against our friends, the Russians. It has all the mischievous articles of the League of Nations and none of its virtues. If indeed that article possessed any virtues, so far as I am concerned, I will never give my consent to submit any question vital to the United States to the arbitrament of a tribunal in which we have one vote out of four, particularly when all the foreign powers are very likely to have interests in common and whose interests are inimical to the United States. Moreover, I will never give my consent that the vote of Japan shall ever at any time determine an American policy. Above everything, I can never give my consent to a treaty by which three foreign powers out-voting the United States can call upon us to sacrifice the blood of our sons and our treasures in controversies thousands of miles from our shores. The proposed treaty is in my judgment treacherous, fraudulent and damnable. It will be repudiated by the American people when it is understood. This conference was called for the alleged purpose of agreeing upon limitation of armament and therefore met with the good will of all lovers of peace and of America, but it has hatched an adder's egg. If it is sanctioned by President Harding, then he has capitulated all his public declarations during the campaign. The American people in due course will know how to deal with that kind of perfidy."

Although the treaty session occupied the attention of the delegates until after noon the Japanese and Chinese, in harmony with the purpose to press collateral issues to a conclusion, held a meeting late in the day and reported considerable progress in the negotiations over Shanghai. Next week the far eastern committee will resume its consideration of the Chinese situation and it is possible that another plenary session will be held next week to record the agreement on naval ratios.

Memorable Chapter.

The hour devoted by the conference to the four power treaty constituted a memorable chapter in the history of diplomacy. Assembled about the big green table in Continental hall, flanked by their advisers and by galleries packed with the notables of many nations, the plenipotentiaries expressed in countenance and bearing as well as in spoken words their realization of the importance of the new international alignment they had effected. Sen. Lodge's address of presentation was delivered with a deliberation and an emphasis which kept the eyes and ears of the spectators hanging on his every word. Rene Viviani, war premier of France, voicing the devotion of his government to peace and concord, rose to passages so eloquent and although he spoke in his native tongue, the house was repeatedly broken by applause. In the clear, direct style so strongly characteristic of British oratory, Arthur J. Balfour related why Great Britain was ready to lay aside her alliance with Japan to accept a place in a broader circle of friendly nations and Prince Tokugawa speaking for Japan, summed up in a few sentences of terse spoken English the gratification of his country at the turn of affairs in the Washington negotiations.

Lodge's Speech Applauded.

Applauds from delegates and galleries alike greeted Sen. Lodge's declaration of the new treaty as an agreement based on good faith, with no military or naval sanctions lurking in the background. Repeatedly he was applauded as he went on to declare that a new day of international understanding had made "this great experiment" possible and to appeal "to the men and women of

the nations to help us sustain it in spirit and in truth."

When he finished, the handclapping continued for more than a minute, many of his colleagues of the senate joining with other spectators in the demonstration.

Mr. Viviani recounted in animated phrases the sufferings of his people in the great war to emphasize the national devotion to instruments of peace. France, he added, would be ready always to keep her word, and although she knew the price of conflict would not hesitate to "deal with blood" any agreement into which she entered.

Turning to the Anglo-Japanese alliance at the outset of his address, Mr. Balfour declared Great Britain was well aware of the suspicion in America because the two power arrangement had been continued after the causes for it had disappeared in the collapse of Germany and Russia.

But the associations of twenty years, he continued, were not easily broken and that break was compensated only by the merging of the old relationship into one of broader import that would bring satisfaction to every part of the empire.

New Agreement Please Japan.

"Japan," Prince Tokugawa said, would likewise rejoice over the new arrangement although, he added, the Japanese reciprocated the British expressions of appreciation over the results of the old alliance. The representatives of the other nations confined themselves to simple declarations of approval except in the case of China, Minister Sze adding for the Chinese delegation that it was to be supposed the treaty would be "supplemented by a further convention to which all the powers, including China, will be parties."

In outlining the scope of the four power agreement the spokesmen of all the participating nations emphasized that it is to apply only to the Pacific islands and in no way to China or any other part of the Asiatic mainland. In the view of some of the American delegates, it applies not only to Hawaii, which American naval authorities always have regarded as a part of the American mainland because it is viceroy of the Pacific "defensive triangle" but also to all of the islands which make up the Japanese empire.

A British spokesman said tonight that although all the Japanese group was to be regarded as within the provisions of the treaty, those belonging to the Netherlands were not to be considered as coming under the agreement, because that government was not a party to it. In the same way, the spokesman said, the minor islands under Chinese sovereignty lay outside the treaty stipulations.

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic stability that could have been devised."

"It leaves nothing to be desired," Sen. New added. "It is a treaty which does not oblige us to mix in some one else's quarrels but it precludes serious disagreements among the nations involved as far as words and good faith can guarantee anything."

Sen. New, Indiana, a republican member of the foreign relations committee, said that the treaty was "a most complete and satisfactory assurance of peace and the greatest security of further economic